A REPLY TO THE ANSWER Made upon the Three Royal PAPERS.

Published by Authority.

LONDON,

Printed for *Matthew Turner*, at the *Lamb* in *High-Holborn*. MDCLXXXVI.

A

REPLY

TO THE

ANSWER

Made upon the

Three Royal

PAPERS.

Published by Authority.

LONDON,

Printed for Matthew Turner, at the
Lamb in High-Holborn. MDCLXXXVI.

THE PREFACE.

ENtring upon the *Answer to the Three* Royal Papers, *whereof the two first were of* CHARLES *the Second of ever blessed memory; and the last of her* Royal Highness *the Dutchess of* York; *I met with a Gentleman of so frank a Temper, that could his Will bribe his Understanding, and he* believe as he pleased, *he tells us he had not fail'd of that Satisfaction in the* KINGS *first Paper, of which for the want of Reason to convince him he was now disappointed. This condescending Humour is a fair step made to the Inquest, by a second Examen of those excellent Truths illustrated by the pregnant Pens and Sense of those Royal Converts. Royal Papers I confess, as to their Value, may be examined, as well as Royal Coin, even by a private Subject. But, as the Royal Stamp in Coin may, under that fair Pretence, by a private Subject be counterfeited, clipt, or otherwise disguised; so Royal Papers, especially of Controversy, are no less ob-*

noxious

noxious to the same Fate; and in this they only differ, that no such Alteration in the KING'S *Coin can be made by a private Subject, but he is look't upon as an ill Man, and acting with an ill Design: Whereas in the* KING'S *Controversial Papers the change either of Sense, or Word, may be made, and that by a well-designing Person, from misunderstanding, inadvertency, or other inculpable Surprize. Now as to this Gentleman to determine any thing, would be a piece of Injustice, for I am ignorant both of his Merits and his Person. What Mist hath overcast his sight, I know not; but if he please to look back by a new Survey, on the three Papers, he may still see in them Reason and Truth so well fixed, that to any thing yet opposed, they stand unconcerned, and as they bear in their Front the Royal Names and Superscription, so their Weight will render them immoveable.*

THE

THE FIRST Royal Paper VINDICATED.

FOrgers and Clippers of Royal Coin ſeek their ſafety in places of all the moſt obſcure; and Diſguiſers and Clippers of Royal Senſe hide themſelves in the ſhades of Equivocation, the **King** availing himſelf in his firſt Paper upon this ſuppoſed Conceſſion, *That Chriſt can have but one Church here upon Earth*, makes this other ſtep, and *I believe that it is as Viſible as that Scripture is in print, that none can be that Church, but that which is called the* **Roman Catholic Church**. Now if the **King** may be allowed to be the beſt expounder of his own words, and if the whole and ſole deſign of this firſt Paper be to evince this truth, That all Controverſial Points of Faith, either about holy Scripture, or other ſub-

jects

jects, do fall under the judgment and decision of the Church, as is manifest it is, then the import of the King's words must be thus, that whatever motives render it visible that a Book in print is Scripture, that is, the Word of God, the same, or other motives are as powerful to render this other truth as visible; *That none can be that Church, but that which is called the Roman Catholic Church.* This is the genuine Sense of the King, and to this the Examinant of the Royal Papers gives this answer. *If particular Controversies about matters of Faith could be ended by a principle as visible as that Scripture is in print, all Men of Sense would soon give over Disputing, for none who dare believe what they see, can call that in question.* Not to contest with him about the impropriety of the phrase, *to believe what one sees*: *Luther* was a bold Man, and yet in the phrase of this Gentleman did not dare to believe what he saw, for the Epistle of St. *James* was in print before his Eyes, he perused it, and yet cast it out of the Canon of Scripture; Catholics and Protestants are both Men of Sense, they have the Books of *Machabees* and others in print, they see them, they handle them; the Catholic gives them their place in the Canon; the Protestants do not only question them, but seem resolv'd to dispute that point to the end; clearly then this principle that the Scripture is in print, is not so unquestionable or indisputable as the Gentleman pretends; and his miscarriage rests in this, That the visibility which in the sense of the King springs from the motives inducing to believe that such or such a Book in

print

print is the holy Scripture, he assigns to a bare print of the Book.

But what if the Church whose Authority 'tis said, they must submit to, will not allow them to believe what they see. My first reply is, That here is a confusion of Notions, for belief is properly of things that are not seen, as the Apostle describes it, *argumentum non apparentium*, and hath Authority for motive; whereas sight or seeing is an inspection into the thing seen, and creates a knowledge of it. Secondly, not to recede from his mode of Speech, I am a stranger to such a Church, and think it impossible to impose upon any Man a command *not to believe what he sees.* For though it may and doth often fall out, that a Man believes what he sees not, yet in true Philosophy it can never happen that a Man may not believe what he sees, and therefore such a command is ranged amongst the impossibles. I well know where his scruple is, and what he would be at; 'tis the Adorable Mystery of the conversion of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of our Redeemer, where he hopes to evince this assertion; but in vain, for what is seen are only the forms, shapes and figures of Bread and Wine, and that we believe to be there; consequently the Church lays upon us no command not to believe what we see. For instance, I will press upon him the two noted passages of holy Scripture, the first is of two Angels appearing to *Lot*, and conversing with him in the figure and shapes of Men. the second is of the Holy Ghosts descent in the form of a Dove; with all, let us suppose that

God hath revealed to *Lot* this truth, that what he did ſee were not Men but Angels in Mens Shape, as he did to the Apoſtles, that what appeared was not a Dove, but the Holy Ghoſt in the Shape of a Dove. I now put this queſtion to him, was this Revelation a Command upon *Lot* or the Apoſtles, not to believe what they did ſee? I believe his Anſwer will be Negative, for if there were neither Men, nor Dove, neither could be ſeen. If then God at any time ſhould reveal to us by his Church, that what is in the Holy Sacrament, is not Bread nor Wine, but the Body and Blood of Chriſt, under thoſe Shapes and Forms, why muſt this revelation be deemed a Command not to believe what we ſee? or where lies the Diſparity? Evidently then there neither is, nor can be, any ſuch Command, and by conſequence no Injury is offered to our Senſes, no reproach to the Church.

His next offer is, at a Clip to the Royal Stamp, and becauſe he ſays 'tis *with Submiſſion*, I preſume it to be unadviſed; for whereas the **Kings** Paper runs thus, *that none can be that Church, but that which is called the* **Roman-Catholic Church**, he ſnips off, I know not how, this word **Catholic**, and ſo reſtrains the **Kings** meaning to the particular Church or Dioceſs of *Rome*, this muſt be confeſſed not to be the beſt way of examining the **King's** Coin, for tho' by this term **Roman** ſometimes all Churches in Communion with the Church of *Rome* be ſignify'd, yet by the Parallel made betwixt the whole and the part, he is convinced not to have meant ſo. To requite then his

his Parallel, 'tis as visible that the word **Roman**, is not **Roman-Catholic**, as that one word is not two, as to the Corruption with which in general Terms, he aſperſed the Roman Church, ſince 'tis as invisible as the Proofs he brings to juſtify the Charge; I ſhall paſs it by.

After it was ſettled, *That Chriſt can have but one Church upon Earth, and that this is that Church we profeſs to believe in the two Creeds.* He thus ſubſumes, *But if thoſe who made thoſe Creeds for our Direction, had intended the Roman-Catholic Church, why was it not ſo expreſſed? how came it to paſs that ſuch a Limitation of the Senſe of Chriſt's Catholic Church to the Roman ſhould never be put to perſons to be baptized in any Age of the Church?*

My firſt Anſwer ſhall be, *ad hominem*, by retorſion: If the Apoſtles intended we ſhould believe that Chriſt was Conſubſtantial to his Father, or that Hereticks were not to be re-baptized, why did they not inſert it into their Creeds? If the Apoſtles and Nicene Fathers, after them intended we ſhould believe the duality of Wills, and unity of Perſons in Chriſt, how did it eſcape both their Creeds? I believe we ſhall jump upon the ſame Solution; which is, that none of theſe Doctrines were queſtioned in thoſe days, no Hereticks had oppoſed them, and therefore there was no need of deciſion, this being the Province of General Councils in framing their Creeds. Let's ſee if this will ſquare to my purpoſe. *Catholic, and Roman-Catholic-Church* in the Language of Antiquity was one and the ſame thing, ſaving when the particular Church or Dio-

eeſs of *Rome* was expreſſed; which being ſo, and the point never call'd in queſtion in the firſt and beſt days of the Church when thoſe Creeds were to be publiſhed, what great ſurprize is it that the word **Roman** ſhould not be comprized in any of their Creeds? Or that it was not enter'd into the ancient Formulary, or Ceremonies of Baptiſm, ſo venerable to after ages, and of which they have ever been moſt tenacious? I have engaged Antiquity for the Roman-Catholic ſide; let's ſee whether ſhe will ſtand by me, and let *Tertullian* lead the Van, who well underſtood the Language both of his own and the foregoing Age. Speak then *Tertullian* what thou knoweſt of *Marcion*'s pecunary Oblation in *Rome* to the *Roman Church*. *Marcion*, ſays he, *gave his money to the Catholic Church, which was rejected when he fell into Hereſie.* Tertul. *contra* Marcion *lib.* 4. *cap.* 4. See how eaſily it dropt from his Pen to ſtile the *Roman Church* the Catholic Church. What's now the ſenſe of St. *Cyprian*, the mouth of the *African* Church, to *Antonianus*? *You writ that I ſhould ſend a Copy of the Letters to* Cornelius (*Biſhop of* Rome) *to the end that he might underſtand that you communicate with him, that is to ſay, with the Catholic Church,* Cypr. *lib.* 4. *epiſt.* 2. And if it be the ſame to communicate with the Pope, as it is with the Catholic Church, then clearly the Roman and Catholic Church are one and the ſame. St. *Ambroſe* in his Funeral Oration upon his Brother *Satyrus*, relates this paſſage of *Satyrus*, that coming into a City polluted with Hereſie, he demands of the Biſhop of the place *whether he was in*

Com-

Communion with the Catholic Biſhop, that is, with the Church of Rome. St. Ambroſ. *Orat. funeb.* So that in the phraſe of that time, communion with the Catholic Church, and Church of *Rome* nothing differ'd. *John* of *Conſtantinople* to *Hormiſda*, Pope, writes thus, *We promiſe hereafter not to recite in the Sacred Myſteries the names of thoſe who have ſeparated themſelves from the Catholic Church, that is to ſay, who agree not fully with the See Apoſtolic.* Tom. 3. Concil. Edit. Binii inter Epiſt. Hormiſdæ. By this we may ſee the ſtile of old times. Nay it was ſo familiar to uſe promiſcuouſly the word *Roman* for *Catholic*, that the very *Arians*, as the Proteſtants now do, called the Catholics by the name of Romaniſts. *Victor* of *Utica* brings in *Jocundus* an *Arian*, thus arguing with King *Theodorick*, *If thou put* Armogaſtus *to death, the* Romaniſts *will proclaim him a Martyr.* Victor. Utic. lib. 2. de perſec. Vandal. And *Gregory* of *Tours* recounts of an *Arian* King, who ſeeing a miracle wrought by a Catholic, concludes that *this was a device of the* Romaniſts. Since therefore in the vulgar Speech and Records of old days, *Roman* and *Catholic* are *Synonima*, the King had much reaſon to declare, *That none could be that Church, but that which is called the Roman-Catholic-Church.* And a rational account is given why the word *Roman* was not expreſſed in the two Creeds, nor in the Ritual of Baptiſm.

From the Church of *Rome*'s not denying the validity of Baptiſm to thoſe who are out of her Communion, he urges thus, *From whence it is to me as viſible as that the Scripture is in print, that the Church*

Church of Rome *it ſelf doth not believe that ſhe is the one Catholic Church mentioned in the Creeds.* This is very pleaſant, it is a fixed principle that there is but one Church Catholic, and the Church of *Rome* by a thouſand Declarations takes it upon her ſelf to be that one Church; and yet it muſt be as *Viſible* to this Gentleman, *as that the Scripture is in print*, that the Church of *Rome* doth *not believe her ſelf to be that one Catholic Church mention'd in the two Creeds*, what can he offer to juſtifie ſo ſtrange a Paradox? *For then*, ſays he, *it muſt void all Baptiſm out of its communion, which it hath never yet done.* But what greater neceſſity is there for the Church of *Rome* to void Baptiſm given out of her Communion, then for the Catholic Church? Or if the Catholic Church doth not make it void, what can oblige the Church of *Rome* to do it? The Reply is, That Baptiſm enters perſons into the Catholic Church, who though they be out of the Communion of the *Roman* Church, yet having the true form of Baptiſm are Members of the Catholic Church. But I beſeech him if Baptiſm enters Men into the Catholic Church, doth not Hereſie, Apoſtacy, or Infidelity caſt them out of the Catholic Church, as well as out of the *Roman* Church? Is it come to this, that *Marcioniſts*, *Ebionites*, *Arians*, *Neſtorians*, *Eutichians*, *Donatiſts*, *Novatians*, and the ſcumm of Heretics, becauſe rightly baptiſed, ſhall be reputed Members of the Catholic Church? This had been great news in the days of St. *Auſtin* who in his forty eighth Epiſtle makes this profeſſion to *Donatus*, *You are with us in Baptiſm, in the Creed,*

in

in the reſt of our Lord's Sacraments, but in the Catholic Church you are not. And St. *Hierom* againſt the *Luciferans*, *No Heretical Congregation can be called a Church of Chriſt.* For though Baptiſm be the Gate by which whoever enters the Church, muſt paſs; yet there is no Man, though baptized, if an Heretic, can remain there.

His next Paragraph is made up by comparing the Church in her Infancy with her ſelf in her fuller growth, and from that different State he would conclude that in her beginnings 'twas eaſy to find out *that one viſible Church*, by reaſon of the ſtrait union of the Faithful in the Bonds of Faith and Charity, *when the Multitude of them who believed were of one Heart and of one Soul*, but not ſo in after Ages, when the Concuſſion of the whole State of the Church by ſo *many factions and diviſions in her Communion*, had ſo obſcured her that they rendred her difficult to be diſcerned. This is the ſum of his diſcourſe in groſs, which I anſwer by detail; after the aſcention of Chriſt there was no time wherein there was not diviſions in the Church, for even in thoſe good days of the Apoſtles, *there went out from them* either by Schiſm, Hereſy, or Apoſtacy, many heads of Factions, who grew into Bodies, and drew after them conſiderable Parties, ſuch as the *Ebionits*, the *Nicholaits*, the *Marcioniſts*, and many more whereof ſome had been Jewiſh, others had been Gentile Chriſtians, but all of them *went out from the Body of the Church*; ſo that notwithſtanding *the Multitude of thoſe who believed were of one Heart and Soul*, yet there were

many

many who fell from their Belief. I ſhall now take leave to ask, whether the Church in the throng of theſe Diviſions was eaſily viſible or no? He grants it was, how then came it to paſs that in after Ages ſhe became ſo obſcure, and as it were inviſible? He replies, *by Diviſions*; but if in both States of the Church there were diviſions, how happens it, that the Cauſe remaining the ſame, ſhould not work the ſame Effect? Was there any Mark, Rule, or Standard, by which the Church was known amidſt her firſt Diviſions, which afterwards diſappeared? If not the Church may be equally viſible in both her States, now if at the riſe of any Hereſie, the Apoſtles, and after them the Apoſtolick Men, uſed all means to ſuppreſs it, either by Preaching, Catechizing, writing againſt it, and meeting in full Aſſemblies for the Comdemnation of it, by ſtigmatizing both the Hereſy, and its Author, cutting him off from the Body of the Church, if I ſay by theſe means the infant Church was rendred as viſible as a Town, ſcituate on a Mountain, or a Light upon a Candleſtick, then the ſame Methods continuing in the Church of after times, do evidently evince that ſhe was, and now is as viſible as ever, and that there was a juſt Performance of this in every Age, is made out by the records of all times: where the time, the place, the Origin, the Author of every Hereſie, the vigorous oppoſition that was made againſt it, the Fathers that writ againſt it, the Paſtors that Preach'd it down, the Councils that condemned it, the Laws of Princes made againſt it, are all ſo exactly

exactly noted, that all the actions and motions of the Church in every Age, were as visible as those of the first and best of times.

As to the remarkable *difference* he mentions *in the nature of Schisms, which happened in the Church, and gave occasion of great misapplications, and sayings of the Antients about the one Catholic Church.* I do not believe it material to observe it, for let the Schism or Heresie be of what nature soever, since the Church in a general Council is the last tribunal in all such Causes, whoever separates, or goes out from her, is to be reputed *as an Heathen, or a Publican*, but because his way of writing merits, that nothing be slighted. I shall march with him through the following Passages. *Some did so break off Communion with other Parts of the Catholic Church, as to challenge that Title wholly to themselves, as was evident in the case of the Novations and Donatists.* If the Novatians and Donatists did break off Communion *with other parts only* of the Catholic Church, I desire to know where the whole Church was at that time? For unless he ranges these Hereticks in the Catholic Church, and so reputes them parts of it, the breach was from the whole, not from parts, as a rotten Branch is separated from the Trunck or the whole Tree. Well, how was the Breach? *By Challenging the Title of the Catholic Church wholly to themselves, as was Evident, for they re-baptized all that embraced their Communion*; not to insist upon other Enormities of these *Novatians* and *Donatists*, by what means were these Monsters crushed? were they not the same that were used in

the first Ages, did not the Pastors watch over their Flock to preserve it from the contagion? did not St. *Austin* and other Fathers sharpen their Pens against them? did not the Church by her Councils cut them off as rotten Limbs from her Body? If nothing of this can be concealed, then clearly she was as visible as ever.

The next instance is from the *Bishops of* Rome *excommunicating the Bishops of* Asia *for not keeping* Easter *when they did, and the Bishops both of* Asia *and* Africa *for not allowing the Baptism of Heretics.* This Breach I confess is of a different Nature from the former, for here the whole Church was not by any of her Councils yet engaged, but the contest was betwixt Parts, tho' some more Eminent than others, and in which 'tis possible, some transports of Passion might intervene. *Irenæus*, 'tis true, expostulates with the Bishop of *Rome*, not that he wanted Authority, but that he exercised it with too much Severity over the Bishops of *Asia*, upon a Subject, he thought not to be of so great Moment. The truth is, both these customs had long obtain'd, the one in the Western, and the other in the Eastern Church, and nothing less then a general Council did set a Period to the Dispute. A Council was called, the decision was made for the Bishop of *Rome*, and Peace was restored to the whole Church: can any Man at this time of day, say that the Church was not as visible as ever? the controversy betwixt *Cornelius*, and *Stephen* Bishops of *Rome* on the one side, and St. *Cyprian* with the *African* Bishops of the other was much of the same Nature,

Nature, nothing was yet defin'd by a general Council, Right stood for the Bishops of *Rome*, the Council determined the point, and the whole Church came to an acquiescence. Had this Gentleman been chosen advocate for the Catholic Church, I know not how he could have render'd her more visible. He proceeds *but is it reasonable to suppose that upon these differences they shut out all those holy Bishops, and Martyrs from the possibility of Salvation*, by excluding *them from their Communion*? How far the heat of these disputes might have carried the Parties engaged, or whether either, or neither party was free from blame, I shall not determine, but this is a certain Maxime both in Church and State, that a submission either active or passive is due to all Lawful Powers, though the command be unjust: and 'tis the known principle of St. *Austin*, with the Ancients, that no cause can be given to separate from the whole Church, either by Heresie or Schism, now in this contest here was no separation from the whole Church by either of the Parties, but a perfect submission to her Decrees when delivered by the mouth of her General Assembly, so that here was not *different Communions amongst Christians*; but only different sentiments in matters as yet undecided by the Church, with which it consisted that both parties were members of the Catholic Church, and consequently no one member of the contesting parties, as this Gentleman well observes, *ought to assume to its self the Title and Authority of the one Catholic Church*. But when Sentence was passed by

a General Council, the dissenting party, if any remained, was cut off as a rotten Member from the Body of the Catholic Church, and then the contest is no more betwixt party and party, but betwixt a rebellious party and the whole Church, to whom the stile of *that one Catholic Church* is justly due, she being the whole; as the Trunk of the Tree is the whole, compared to any Limb; and the *Novatians* and *Donatists* her putrified Members.

Amongst other calamities which have sprung from original corruption 'tis not the least, that being our selves Criminals, we have an itch to find out confederates, as if their number rendered us Innocent. This assailant of the Royal Papers to justifie the late separation of the Protestants from the Roman Catholic Church, brings upon the Stage the Eastern Churches, cut off and separated from her Communion, And adds *that the Bishops of* Rome *would hear of no other terms of accommodation with the Eastern Church, but by an intire submission as head of the Catholic Church, which all the Churches of the East refus'd however different amongst themselves, and to this day look on the Popes Supremacy as an innovation in the Church.* How well skill'd he is in the History of the Eastern Churches I shall not dispute. But sure all is not Game that rises, and I doubt the account given him is made up of false Musters. This is certain the Eastern Churches were divided from the Roman-Catholic Church, that is, from all Churches in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, by such Doctrines as are inconsistent even with the Church of *England*, which professes

profeſſes to hold whatever was decreed by the firſt four general Councils, and this breach of union continues with their deſcendents to this day. The *Egyptians*, *Ethiopians*, and *Abiſſines* are by Sect *Eutichians*, holding but one Nature, Will, and Operation in Chriſt, and are condemned by the fourth general Council, that is of *Chalcedon*, with theſe ſide part of the *Armenians*, the *Jacobites*, *Georgians* and *Cophties*. The *Chriſtians* under the *Turk* and *Perſians* in *Aſia*, are *Neſtorians*, branded by the General Council of *Epheſus* for maintaining two perſons in Chriſt. The *Grecians* with the *Muſcovites* and *Ruſſians*, by the *Athanaſian* Creed (ſo Sacred to the Church of *England*) are excluded, even from Salvation, for refuſing to believe the Holy Ghoſt to proceed from the Father and the Son. As to the firſt diviſion of the *Greek* Church, the true cauſe was from the conteſt betwixt *Ignatius* true Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and *Photius* the intruder, with the firſt ſtood the Pope, and the Emperor with the laſt; and in the end, to make the breach the wider, the proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from Father and Son was denyed, and ſo it reſts till this day; now that the Pope's Supremacy was and is look'd on as an innovation by any of theſe Churches I doubt is a ſtory not ſo well grounded as this Gentleman could wiſh.

And if my Authors deceive me not, ſome of theſe, as the *Egyptians* and *Ethiopians*, have often made overtures to the Pope for Peace and Communion, owning him Supream Head of the Church, provided only they might not be obliged to renounce

nounce *Entiches* and *Dioſcorus*. After theſe fundamental Errours of Faith againſt the Holy Ghoſt, and the perſon of Jeſus Chriſt, he put this queſtion, *how then came they to be excluded from being parts of the one Catholic and Apoſtolic Church? Since in all thoſe Churches the two Creeds are profeſſed, true Baptiſm adminiſtred.* A Man would have thought that ſuch blaſphemies againſt the Divinity and Humanity of Chriſt, had been cauſe enough to have Unchurched any number of Men, but ſince he ſeems to opine that the denyal of the two firſt Creeds can do the work, why ſhould not the refuſal of a third Creed (or if the emergencies of new ſtarted Doctrines made it neceſſary) a fourth and fifth Creed be as prevalent? Is the power of the Church Catholic in deciding Faith, leſs then it was in making the ſecond Creed? Again, is it not as poſſible for Men who profeſs a Creed to err even againſt that Creed, as it is for Men profeſſing a Rule to deviate from that Rule? Wherefore it being evident that nothing of all this hath been wanting to fill up the meaſure of Hereſie in thoſe Eaſtern Churches, they cannot *be reputed parts of the one Catholic and Apoſtolic Church*, conſequently the *Roman* Church, and the Churches in Communion with her muſt be that one Church, or there was, or is, none upon Earth.

This principle then *that the* Roman *Church is that one Catholic and Apoſtolic Church* being as viſible as was aſſerted by the King *to enter into the Ocean of particular diſputes*, would be to enter into the maze of everlaſting jarring: Pregnant evidence of this truth

truth is had from the pretended Reformation of this laſt Age, where the innumerable Sects that have ſwarm'd from the firſt Reformers in the divided World, ſteering their courſe, as they fancy, by the Compaſs of Holy Scripture (a preſident given them by their Leaders) have improved controverſie to that degree, that 'tis impoſſible by that method to reclaim them, the Scholar ſtill in that out-doing his Maſter. And whereas it is believed by this Gentleman, *That the Church of* Rome *hath notoriouſly deviated from this infallible rule* (Scripture ſenſed by fancy, for neither he concerns himſelf for Tradition nor Expoſition of the Fathers) and therefore is not willing to put her ſelf upon that iſſue. I anſwer, that the Church of *Rome* cannot deviate from a rule ſhe never profeſſed to follow. And if ſome of her Champions out of meer condeſcenſion to Proteſtants have fought them with their own weapons (in which way of combating the Church is not engaged) the judgment of the victory muſt be from the arbitration not of any private Man, but of the Learned World.

The **King**'s next poſition is, *That it is not left to every phantaſtical Man's head to believe as he pleaſes*, but to the Church. Beware here of counterfeit Coin, 'twas out but he called it in again, and replies, *The Church of* England *cannot be liable to any imputation of this nature, for our Church receives the three Creeds, embraces the four General Councils, and profeſſes to hold nothing contrary to any univerſal Tradition of the Church from the Apoſtles time.* Had he been pleaſed to have given in ſecurity for the Church

Church of *England*, that notwithſtanding this glorious profeſſion, ſhe could never err againſt the Creeds, nor the four Councils, nor univerſal Tradition, he had well merited of that Church. For we do not charge her for not profeſſing theſe things, at leaſt upon a pinch, but for erring againſt her own profeſſion, and deſerting that Church to which all theſe Authorities bear teſtimony, and of which her Progenitors, and firſt Reformers had been Members, and from whoſe hands ſhe received whatſoever ſhe had, either of Scripture, Creeds, Councils, or Tradition, conſequently whoſe judgment ſhe was bound to follow; for the Eaſtern Churches even by the profeſſion of Proteſtants being lapſed into Hereſies, there was then no viſible Church in Being but ſuch as was in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, which never went out of any elder than her ſelf, and out of whom the Church of *England* ſprang. It ſeems *he would have the Controverſie betwixt us put upon this iſſue*, that is, *the three Creeds, four Councils, and Tradition.* But who ſhall be Umpire, the inſtructing, or inſtructed Party? This diſcourſe in the mouth of a Proteſtant againſt Presbyterian, Anabaptiſt, or Quaker would be ſound, though at the ſame time a ſelf-condemnation in the Church of *England*. The reſt of this Paragraph is made up of voluntary aſſumptions without proof, and which are already anſwered as to the main; only I cannot let ſlip this conceſſion, *we do not deny that the Church hath Authority of declaring matters of Faith*, but this muſt be *the univerſal Church in a General and*

and free Council, as when the Nicene *Creed was made, not when a party in the Church, the most corrupt, takes upon it self to define many new Doctrines.* This plea, if it be good, justifies the *Arians*, and condemns the *Nicene* Fathers, vindicates the *Eutichians*, *Nestorians*, and *Donatists*, and confounds all General Councils, for there is nothing of this but was as fully charged against them by the Heretics of those days. The following Paragraph is adulterated Coin, for whereas the **King** *by the inhabitants of a Country* means Subjects, instituting the comparison betwixt them and their Lawful Judges of the same Country, he stretches those words to signifie the People of one Society, and Judges of another.

The **King**'s discourse is home, and to the purpose, *God would not leave us at those uncertainties, as to give us a Rule to go by, and leave every Man to be his own Judge.* He answers, *We cannot reasonably suppose God should give us a Rule not capable of being understood by those to whom it was given to save their Souls.* As if there were no way to render a Man capable of understanding Scripture, to the saving of his Soul, but to leave him to be his own Judge? Is there no Church? No Pastors to instruct him? He that is blind or dim-sighted and will not use a Guide, merits to fall. Not to be wilfully mistaken in matters of Faith, and not to be damn'd is of one and the same consequence: The knowledge of good and evil, truth and falshood, I confess, in some sense, is to Man's conscience of the same concern, but he that willingly shuns light,

and gropes for either of them in the dark is an Enemy to his Soul, and equally culpable. There follows, *We do not leave every Man to be his own Judge any farther then concerns his own Salvation, which depends upon his particular care and ſincerity.* But if the judgment of his own Salvation be in his own hands, I think he is made his own Judge of the Rule: And notwithſtanding all his care and ſincerity (though they ſhould protect him from the Artifices of *foreign Seducers*, which is not poſſible but by accident, without an inerrable Guide) yet the corruption of his own heart may be his own moſt powerful Seducer, and God, if he will, hath provided a guide even againſt that. As to his refuge to the Ancient Creeds, of how little concern it is, may appear by this, that if I ſhould allow they followed exactly what they pretend to embrace, (which I never can) yet if he denies it to be in the power of the Church to make new deciſions of Faith, upon any new exigence of Hereſie, or the like, the ſequel will be that *every Man is left to be his own Judge.*

To the queſtion ſtarted by the King, *Whether it be not the ſame thing to follow our own phanſie; or to interpret Scripture by it.* His reply is, *That if we allowed no Creeds, no Fathers, no Councils, there might have been ſome colour for ſuch a queſtion.* And is that colour vaniſh'd? I believe not; for if thoſe Creeds, thoſe Fathers and Councils have no infallible Authority to oblige the Church of *England*, why ſhould not the King's queſtion be ſtill in force? For neither is that Church obliged to follow

low thoſe Rights which may deceive it, nor is there any rational Authority in the Church of *England* to force any of her Members to embrace them. But the truth is, that Church neither ſtands to Creeds, Fathers or Councils, otherwiſe ſhe had never deſerted her Mother Church, who ever regarded thoſe Authorities as Oracles infallible, and ſent from Heaven to direct us, and to whom ſhe owes whatever is Sacred of that nature. To his firſt queſtion of the Church of *Rome affirming to it ſelf the ſole power of giving the ſenſe of the Scripture.* I anſwer, ſhe gives no ſenſe but what ſhe received from former Tradition of the foregoing Church, and conſequently makes not any Rule to her ſelf, but follows that Apoſtolical Tradition, which God hath given her as the beſt interpreter of holy Scriptures. To his ſecond queſtion the anſwer is the ſame. The third queſtion ſtands upon a falſe bottom, for it ſuppoſes the Pope to be the ſole interpreter of Scripture, whereas neither he nor the Church do pretend to any other way, but by Tradition. The fourth queſtion is alſo grounded upon Errour, as if the publick diſorders which happen in the Church were not to be reformed by General Councils. The fifth queſtion is alſo built upon Sand, for it pretends that the Papal Authority is to be debated in Councils, whereas no General Council did ever diſpute it. The ſixth queſtion is as ſtrange as any, for it confounds Phancy, and Tradition, whereas the one is publick to the whole World, and the other is private.

His next Paragraph adulterates the Royal Coin, for when the King demands to know *where the power of deciding matters of Faith is given to every particular person*, the ſenſe is clear, for the queſtion cannot be meant otherwiſe than in relation to himſelf. But he extends it ſo, as if every one was to give Laws to another's Faith, and this without any ground, is made the firſt Member of the diviſion. But he adds, *If by deciding matters of Faith, no more be meant, but every Man's being ſatisfied of the reaſons why he believes one thing to be true, and not another, that belongs to every Man, as he is bound to take care of his Soul.* So that by his reply every Man whoſe Soul is dear to him, may and ought to diſcuſs, and diſpute every Article of his Faith, and bring it to the Teſt of his own reaſon; and ſo the Omnipotence of a God revealing, and the Authority of a Church declaring what is revealed, weighs not with him until reaſon be ſatisfy'd, and the underſtanding becomes a meaſure of all revealed Truths. Whereas, in truth, Authority is the correlative of Believing, and Reaſon of Knowledge. And though we make uſe of our reaſon to find out that Authority which ought to ſway us, as a blind Man ſerves himſelf with his reaſon to find out his Guide; yet after that, 'tis Authority, not Reaſon that moves us, and the previous motives inducing us to embrace the Authority of the Church, from whence we have Scriptures, and all other inſcrutable Myſteries, are much more viſible and reſplendent than for any other Article of our Faith.

The

The King goes on, *Christ left power in his Church even to forgive sins*, &c. He replys, *But where then was the Roman Catholic Church?* Undoubtedly where now it is, one and the same, from whence all other pretended Churches went out, she never departing from any Church, that was elder than her self. If she had, I doubt not but her Eagle-ey'd adversaries would long er'e this have brought to light the Fathers, the Councils, or whatever else stood in opposition against her, and since they never did, nor can, their plea against her is common to all whoever opposed the true Church. In a good Sense therefore she alone remains *Heir general to the Apostles*, as to those gifts which were not personal but given by Christ for the necessary support and government of her self, which is to continue untill the consummation of Time. And though he seems surprised that God should keep *Man more from Error than from Sin.* Yet if he recalls but to mind that some of the Prophets were led into truths by the holy Spirit, and were great Sinners at the same time, and that all the Prophets (though infallible in delivering such truths as God put into their mouths) yet were obnoxious to sin, the miraculous surprize will cease, and the reason why infallibility is necessary, and not impeccability, is manifest, because without the first the Church could not subsist, for if once she makes Shipwrack of her Faith, she is no more a Church, an effect not so proper to sin. And whereas he demands, *Would any have believed the Apostles infallible, if they had known them to have been persons of ill lives.*

lives. I answer yes, for either by Miracles wrought in confirmation of their Infallibility, or any other way they could have an assurance of it. As to any concession that the Church may err in deposing Princes, if he means she may err in the decision of Truth, or definition of Faith about it, he is purely beholding to himself for that concession, not to the **King**, or any else I know of, who only engage for her inerrability in delivering what she received from Christ and his Apostles by an uninterrupted Tradition, and in conformity to this Rule, the Church of *Rome*, with all those in Communion with her, (the rest either by Heresie, or Apostacy being divided from her) was judge even of the Scripture it self what was Canonical, what not, or else it had been impossible for the Church of *England* to have known any thing of Truth concerning that Point; there being no other Church to inform her, but what had forfeited her Credit by manifest Heresie, and that owned by the Church of *England*, this is a vindication of the **King** against three of his Paragraphs.

The **King** having put the question, *by what Authority Men separate themselves from that Church?* He replies that they have not separated themselves from the *Catholick and Apostolick Church*, but *are disjoyned from the Roman Church; that we may keep up the Stricter Union with the truly Catholick and Apostolick Church.* But if the *English* Church reputes it self a Member of the Chatholick Church, because she professes to stand to the three Creeds, and four first general Councils, then certainly the *Arians*, *Nestorians*,

Neſtorians, *Eutichians*, and the Eaſtern Churches above-mentioned, cannot be parts of the Catholick Apoſtolick Church, becauſe they hold not the Apoſtolick Doctrine contain'd in thoſe Creeds, and Councils. But beſides thoſe Churches, there were no other in Being at the time of Separation, but thoſe Churches, which were in communion with the Church of *Rome*, conſequently the Church of *England* going out from them, ſeparated her ſelf from the Catholick, Apoſtolick Church, and therefore unleſs he can prove the Church of *Rome* to have deſerted any other elder Church than her ſelf by Uſurpation or otherwiſe, his Story of an Uſurper will be but a Shift, and may authoriſe all Rebellion, either in Church or State.

The laſt Paragraph is, ſince Proteſtants do charge the Church of *Rome with Impoſition of new Articles of Faith*, the King deſires to know who is *to be judg of that, whether the whole Church, the Succeſſion whereof hath continued to this Day without Interruption; or particular Men who have raiſed Schiſms to their own Advantage.* The Roman Church having been in Poſſeſſion of all thoſe Truths (now queſtioned by the Men of the Church of *England*) nothing can be more unreaſonable than to deveſt her of her juſt Poſſeſſion, and to require her to fall a proving: whereas this ought to be the Province of thoſe, who under the Pretence of Innovation revolted from her. For either they muſt make good their charge, or elſe by all Laws they ſtand condemned, and ſhe remains juſtified. Wherefore ſince at the time of ſeparation, ſhe owned the

the Papal Supremacy, and other Articles to have deſcended to her by an univerſal Tradition, whoever queſtions the Title, muſt convince her of that pretended Uſurpation, and then as it is well obſerved by the King, who ſhall be judg in that caſe? To have anſwered the Royal Paper, this Method he ſhould have minded, which in diſputes of another Nature, I doubt not but he would have Practiſed. However after his challenging the Church to prove her Poſſeſſion, he proceeds to declare, that the Proteſtants being now by falling from the Church of *Rome* (of whom they were once a part) at Liberty, betook themſelves to the Examination of the Popes Supremacy, and other Articles of the Council of *Trent*, by Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils, but could find nothing in any of them to make out that Supremacy, or any Article now in diſpute. But ſtill the King's Queſtions preſſed upon them, *who ſhall be Judge?* Is not this a Preſident for all Rebellion, either in Church or State? They have neither Scripture, Tradition, Councils, nor Fathers, but what they had from the Roman Church, and at the firſt Breach, they were in number very Inconſiderable and yet by a ſtrange Preſumption they pretend to have a clearer Sight into thoſe Principles, than that Church, who gave them their very Being in Chriſtianity.

I believe, were this Gentleman to argue againſt thoſe Sects that have ſpawn'd from the Church of *England*, he would not ſuffer a pride ſo intollerable, as to prefer their own ſenſe in Scriptures,

or

or the Rule of Faith before that Church that gave them the Rule. Well, but *having finiſhed this inquiry*, What did they do? He goes on thus: *Articles of Religion were drawn up, wherein the Senſe of our Church was delivered agreable to Scripture and Antiquity, not the private ſenſe of particular Men.* If they be Articles of Religion, then they are Articles of Faith; if ſo, they muſt come by Divine Revelation, either by the way of Holy Scripture, Tradition, or otherwiſe. Now I beſeech him to declare in which of theſe principles are all, or any of theſe negative Articles contained; as *no praying to Saints, no Purgatory, no reverencing of Images, no Tranſubſtantiation*, and the like, with which the nine and thirty Articles are ſtuft? Clearly this is a new Creed, which neither the Eaſtern, nor Weſtern Churches did ever profeſs to hold: Nor will it avail to reply, that nothing *of praying to Saints, Purgatory*, or the like is to be found in the Scriptures or Antiquity (which notwithſtanding is a manifeſt illuſion) for if they be Articles of Religion, or of Faith, he muſt bring poſitive Texts to aſſert them, by which all perſons ſhould be obliged to believe them, and ſo to Sacrifice their Lives for them, if occaſion ſhould be; otherwiſe the Creed-makers will be lookt upon as Cheats, and their new Creeds as the deluding Fancies of particular Men. As to the advantages of the Clergy in the Church of *Rome*, I muſt needs confeſs they are very conſiderable, and therefore not likely to be loſt by any Reformation in Religion, ſince if an Angel from Heaven ſhould bring it,

they are caution'd not to receive him: But that *the Clergy should be against, and Princes for the Church of* Rome, is as surprizing as that a Clergy may be byast, and a Prince unbyast, a Blessing so signally fallen from Heaven upon the Prince who now reigns, and his blessed Brother, that no advantage under Heaven can be thought so powerful as to have byast them in their Choice.

THE

THE SECOND Royal Paper VINDICATED.

HIS late Majesty out of Paternal commiseration, and his Princely care for the safety of this Nation breaks out into this complaint, *It is a sad thing to consider what a world of Heresies are crept into this Nation.* And this Assailant is much concerned that no distinction should be made, *between the Religion establish'd by Law, and the Parties disowned by it, and dissenting from it.* As if an establishment of a Religion by Law, could protect it from being an Heresie, or as if Error fix'd by a Law were not more to be pityed, than what is vagrant and unsetled. He need not trouble himself to vindicate other Sects from Heresie, against the four or six General Councils, let him defend his own and his

work is done. *But how comes the Church of* England *to bear the blame of ſo many Hereſies?* The reaſon is obvious to any one who reflects upon the breach ſhe made from the Church of *Rome*, and by that example opened a Gate for all Hereſies to enter; nay the truth is, ſhe is a fruitful Womb of Hereſies, of which, Time has and will ſtill deliver her; for by throwing the Rule of Obedience and Government over-board, the Presbyterians revolted from her; from them the Anabaptiſts, the Quakers, and how many links more there will, or may be, God alone can tell, ſince 'tis not in the power of that Church, but by the Sword to ſuppreſs them, which if ſhe ſhould uſe againſt them, nothing would be more unreaſonable than to perſecute them for adhering too cloſely to a Rule, or Example which ſhe firſt gave them. To his Queſtion, *How came the Church of* Rome *to have this power of defining or declaring what's Hereſie?* I anſwer, By the ſame way the Church had power in her General Councils to make Creeds, and Anathmatize Hereticks; and as the Church then did not make any new Articles of Faith, when ſhe defined that the Son was Conſubſtantial to the Father, and that Chriſt had two Wills, and one Perſon; ſo the Church of *Rome* in her definitions never pretends to make new Articles of Faith but to declare the old ones.

When the **King** had pronounced, *That every Man thinks himſelf as competent a Judge of Scripture as the Apoſtles themſelves.* He anſwers by a Counter-queſtion, *Does every one amongſt us pretend to*

an

an infallible Spirit? Yes, for by this Gentleman's Poſition, no Man of them will believe but what he ſees or underſtands in the Scriptures, and in what they ſee or underſtand, he conceives they cannot be deceived, conſequently their Spirit is infallible; *To uſe* a Man's *underſtanding about Scripture*, is not to *be Judge of Scripture*. For a Man that ſo uſes his underſtanding as to ſubmit it to the Tradition of the Church, makes the Church the Judge, and not himſelf: And whoever uſes his underſtanding in oppoſition to the Churches Tradition, makes himſelf judge indeed, but not to *his Salvation*. *We*, ſays he, *own the Authority of Guides in the Church, and a due ſubmiſſion to them*. What's this? Is that ſubmiſſion ſo due that Heaven will be loſt without it? If ſo, his Church is as competent a Judge as the Apoſtles, for that is the only puniſhment due to thoſe who hear not them, if otherwiſe the ſubmiſſion is *ad pompam*, and in the ſenſe of the King *every Man thinks himſelf as competent a Judge of Scripture, as the very Apoſtles themſelves*.

The King gives here a Reaſon for his foregoing Aſſertion, and the ſum of it is, that the Church of *England* dares not preſs her Authority upon other Sects in giving the ſenſe of Scriptures, for fear they ſhould confound her, for having caſt off the Authority of that Church, of which ſhe was once a Member, and to whom ſhe was equally bound to ſubmit. To this he replys, That the Church of *England* pretends to no *Infallibility*; but this is to diſguiſe the Royal Coin, for the King abſtracts from all Infallibility, and his Argument is as force-

able

able without it, as with it; for if the Sectaries can with truth caſt it in the Teeth of the Church of *England*, that ſhe diſobey'd her Mother Church, whether ſhe were Infallible, or not, the Church of *England* can never juſtly charge them with any diſobedience to her. But *ſome Heads* of the *Roman* Church *have been not barely ſuſpected of Hereſie, for one of them ſtands condemned for it in three General Councils.* But what's this to the King's Reaſon? who in neither of his Papers, as I can ſee, defends any Man from the poſſibility of falling into Hereſie.

Not to multiply Diſputes, nor to recede from the King's Papers, I ſhall not dive deeper into the Queſtion, Whether the Church of *England* be a true Church or no, ſince the King did not. Yet I could reply to this brisk Gentleman, as St. *Auſtin* (by me already cited) did to the *Donatiſts*, That all that he has raked together, if it ſhould be allowed to be in the Church of *England*, yet ſomething would be wanting to make her a true Church. Well then, what is the Church of *England* charged with? 'Tis thus, ſays the King, *She would fain have it thought that they are Judges in matters ſpiritual, yet dare not ſay poſitively there is no Appeal from them.* His Reply is from a Parity betwixt Inferiour and Superiour Courts, where both are truly Judges, yet there lyes an Appeal from an Inferiour to a Superiour Court, and he inſtances in Courts both Spiritual and Temporal. But the Parity is very lame, for the Church of *England* ſuppoſes her ſelf not inferiour to any other Church, nor

nor will ſhe ſubmit to any others Dictamen, as things ſtand, conſequently, as things ſtand, ſhe is the laſt Tribunal of Spiritual Doctrine. In the next Paragraph the King argues thus, *What Country can ſubſiſt in quiet where there is not a Supreme Judge, from whence there can be no Appeal.* From hence this Gentleman infers, that every National Church ought to have the Supreme *Power within its ſelf.* This is no good Illation, unleſs it be in reference to the Church of *England*, which will have no ſuch Superiour to it, for the King ſpeaks of a Country over which there is no Juriſdiction out of its ſelf, conſequently there muſt be in that Country a Supreme Judge in all Temporal Cauſes, but one Church which is ſubordinate to another Church, and owns her ſelf but a Member of an univerſal Church in Being, cannot be ſaid to be the laſt Tribunal from whence there can be no Appeal. The reſt of this Paragraph is a running diviſion upon certain Abuſes complain'd of by ſome Saints, which becauſe they may happen in the beſt of Ages, and to the beſt of Men without prejudice to the lawful Authority of the Church, I paſs them by, and ſhall make my Obſervation upon the next Paragraph, that whereas the King's Expoſtulation is, *We have had theſe Hundred Years paſt, the ſad Effects of denying to the Church that Power in matters Spiritual, without Appeal.* By which Expreſſion, as alſo by the antecedent and conſequent Diſcourſes, is meant an Appeal to the Univerſal Church, in matters Spiritual; as *Interpretation of Scripture, Delivery of Doctrine, Deciſions of Faith*, &c. He applies

applies the Context against Personal Appeals to the Pope; and then declaims against abuses of those Appeals; of which, both our own and neighbour Princes have complained, *and have been forced for the preserving of their own Dignity, to set Bounds and Limits to Appeal to* Rome. But, admit the King had intended Appeals to *Rome*, does not this Gentleman by this reply, That Princes have limited or bounded these Appeals to *Rome*, own that Princes have believed that Appeals do of Right belong to *Rome*, provided that Power be not abused? And if the King himself was likely to suffer the most by them, the more was his Integrity in preferring his Conscience before his Interest. This Paragraph then is a Counterfeit of the Royal Stamp; and so is the next, by which the King is also misrepresented; for which Reason I shall make no remark upon it.

Here begins the Kings application of his former Discourse, by which this Gentleman may see his Error. *This is our Case here in* England *in matters Spiritual, for the Protestants are not of the Church of* England, *as it is the true Church from whence there can be no Appeal; but because the Discipline of that Church is conformable at the present to their fancies, &c.* He returns thus, *What Security can be greater than that of our Judgments?* For he will not have it to be *Fancy*. I Answer, That to submit our Judgments to that of the Catholic Church, which God has appointed to direct us, is the greatest Security we can have, and in competition with this all is but Fancy. And, since he appeals to the whole

whole World, *whether we have not made it appear, that 'tis not Fancy, but Judgment, which hath made us firm to the Church of England*, He is already caſt by as many Votes, as there are Men out of the Church of *England*. Their adherence to the Crown, of which he ſpeaks, is ſo principal a part of the Church of *England* as it is eſtabliſhed by Law, that without it that Church cannot ſubſiſt; but, when the Fancy ſhall move to change that Religion into Presbytery, or any thing elſe, Loyalty is out of Doors. Now againſt thoſe of the Church of *Rome* the Argument will not have that force, for they and their Anceſtors ever profeſſing that Church to be their Infallible Miſtreſs, and that upon ſuch Motives that nothing would be found more powerful; their Judgment is fix't upon ſuch a Baſis, that for want of it all other Churches which own themſelves Fallible, that is, both apt to deceive and be deceived, are but in a Tottering ſtate. What follows in this Paragraph is a Recrimination barely cenſuring, without proving, ſome Tenets of the Catholic Church, as pure Fancy.

The Thread of the King's Diſcourſe being ſtill the ſame, He concludes, *So, that according to this Doctrine there is no other Church nor Interpreter of Scripture but which lies in every mans giddy Brain.* By which he may be aſſured the King calls that only a giddy-Brain, which ſtands in oppoſition to the great Authority of the Church interpreting Scripture. But ſays the Anſwerer, *Let mens Brains be as giddy as they are ſaid to be, they are the beſt*

Faculties they can make uſe of for the underſtanding of Scriptures, or any thing elſe. Undoubtedly they are with that Aſſiſtance of an infallible Church, which God has given them, ſince many things, to be underſtood there, are out of the reach of Man's private Reaſon, which he makes uſe of to find out his Guide, being as viſible as a City upon a Hill, or a Light on a Candleſtick, and then ſubmits to her Interpretation of Scriptures; ſo that the *infallible Church* lies not in every Man's giddy Brain, but is as viſible as the Sun.

Upon the winding up of this Diſcourſe, the **King** deſires to know *of every Serious Conſiderer of theſe things whether the great work of our Salvation ought to depend upon ſuch a Sandy Foundation as this.* Upon this Propoſal of the **King's**, he runs out into an airy Excurſion againſt the Church of *Rome*, under a pretence *of a new Faith*, hatch'd in the Council of *Trent*; which being an aſſertion, as voluntary as 'tis Sandy, it leaves the Church unattack't, and ſtill ſtanding upon a Rock. But I appeal ſays he, to any *ingenious Man, whether he doth not as much build upon his own Judgment, who chooſeth the Church, as he who chooſeth the Scripture for his Rule.* The anſwer is eaſy; for certainly a Man hath more reaſon to rely upon his own Judgment in finding out the Church, than the Scripture, ſince the one is a Noon-day Light, and may be diſcovered by every one, the other is in the dark, and ſo might continue, if not diſcovered by the Light of the Church. He advances; for the Church *can never be a Rule without*

out the Scriptures, but the Scriptures may without the Church. It ſeems this Gentleman has forgot there was a Church before the Scriptures were written, and conſequently a Rule; nay, ſome Ages paſſed before a Collection of the Books of Scripture was made, and owned by the Catholic Church (for certainly the Apoſtles, and Apoſtolick Men did not, when they went to convert the World by Preaching, bring about Waggons laden with Bibles to every Pariſh, and even in St. *Irenæus* his time there were many barbarous Nations Converted that could neither Write nor Read) the Church then was the only Rule without the Scripture; but without light from the Church, there could be no certainty of Scripture, either as to the Book it ſelf, or to the Copy, or the Tranſlation or Sence of it. He puſhes farther, *it is no ſuch eaſy matter to find the Churches Infallibillity in the Scripture.*

I anſwer there is no abſolute neceſſity of finding it in the Scripture, ſince the Church was found out, before the new Teſtament was in Being, and if God's ſpecial good Providence had not given us the Scriptures to our great Comfort, yet the Church notwithſtanding would have ſtill been viſible to the World's End, and therefore when we cite thoſe texts of Scripture about *Chriſt's being with his Church to the end of the World*, about *the Power to forgive Sins*, about *God's Labourers*, *Husbandry* and the like, tis only *ad abundantiam*, and to ſhew the advantages the Church hath over her Enemies, even at their own Weapons. But, in his opinion,

theſe Texts of Scripture do as *effectually prove the infallibility of the Church of* England *as of the Church of* Rome. But I beſeech him, how can a Church but of yeſterday, and whoſe Negative Articles of Faith were lately Coined, dure from Chriſt to the World's end.

The laſt thing the **King** charges upon *thoſe who reſiſt the truth, and will not ſubmit to this Church*, is that they *draw their arguments from implications and far fetch'd interpretation, at the ſame time that they deny plain and poſitive words; which is ſo great a diſingenuity that 'tis not almoſt to be thought, that they can believe themſelves.* This I perceive touches to the quick, but truth, though ſhe cuts, muſt ſtill be amiable. *Is it*, ſays the Anſwerer, *to deny truth, to argue from implications, and to deny plain and poſitive words of Scripture, to ſay we muſt not worſhip Images, we muſt make God alone the Object of holy Worſhip.* I reply, it is, for nothing of this is to be found in Scripture; and, if the word *Image* had been in the Commandments, as it is not (the Original ſignifying *a graven thing*) yet it would be an *implication*, or *far-fetch'd interpretation*, becauſe it is ſingled out, and ſnatch't from the context, which gives life to the words, importing *Divine* Worſhip: Nor is it any where *expreſſed*, That *God alone is the Object of holy Worſhip*: Though it may be deduced thence, that worſhip to holy things is refer'd to God alone as the only final Object of all ſuch Worſhip. Again, to ſay that Chriſt's *Inſtitution* of the Euchariſt in both kinds is a *Command* to the Lay-people to receive it in both kinds, is an

implication

implication confounding *Inſtitution* with a *Command*, which are very different. For Matrimony was *Inſtituted* by God, yet I know no Man by virtue of the Inſtitution *commanded* to Marry. Laſtly, The diſcourſe of St. *Paul* touching the underſtanding of our Prayers meddles not with the publick, or ſettled Liturgy of the Church, as may be evinced from the Chapter it ſelf. So that for any of thoſe Examples there is neither plain nor poſitive words of Scripture on their ſide. Let us now change ſides, and ſee how it ſquares with the Catholic Party: They affirm Bread to be changed into the Body of Chriſt, becauſe of theſe plain and poſitive words, *This is my Body*; this is true, becauſe the words are ſo plain that they import no implication of Impoſſibility, or Abſurdity, (a Rule obſerved by the Fathers in the underſtanding of Scriptures literally) but againſt this there lyes an Objection, That it is *as plain and poſitive in Scripture*, that *God has Eyes, Ears, Hands and Feet.* My reply is, That there is an Implication of Impoſſibility, which appears not in the plain Senſe of theſe words, *This is my Body.* He preſſes to know the difference betwixt theſe two Propoſitions, *A Rock is Chriſt*, and *This is my Body.* I anſwer, That had it been thus, *Bread is my Body*, there had been none, for then both Propoſitions would have imply'd an Impoſſibility. But the words being *This is my Body*, the words are plain, as to their Senſe, that they inferr neither Impoſſibility, nor Abſurdity, ſince by theſe omnipotent words the Bread is changed into the Body

of

of Christ, which neither is impossible to God, nor absurd to do; and therefore in those places where Christ is said to be *Bread*, 'tis always with some Emphasis, as *the Bread of Life*, *this Bread*, or *the Bread*, which clearly imports an Analogy.

The Conclusion of this Royal Paper, is, That *if the Civil Magistrate pleases he may turn the Protestant Church either to Presbytery, or Independency, or indeed to what he pleases, for this was the way of our pretended Reformation in* England, *and by the same Rule*, &c. This he tells the King is an *unkind requital* to the Church of *England*, for her Zeal in asserting his Majesties power against a foreign Jurisdiction. But Truth, methinks, when uttered with design of publick good, ought never to be taken unkindly, especially from the Pen of a King; and if it seems an ill *requital*, I am sure it is a worse *complement* to palliate one Errour with another. The King's reason is to the purpose; for, as our Princes lately, notwithstanding all Laws Divine and Humane, did by their Regal Power cancel a Religion which came into this Nation with Christianity, and was Established by more strong and forcing Laws, than ever gave Being or Preservation to the Church of *England*: For besides a thousand years Prescription, and the Immunities and great Priviledges of the Clergy, it was so Fenced with the great Charter of *England*, *Magna Charta*, that nothing but the forcing of this, could ruine that: As, I say, some Princes have by their power wrought a change from that Religion into another, how much more is it in their hands to turn

turn the Proteſtant Church into Presbytery or Independency; ſince Proteſtancy is but of a freſh date, and hath no other Foundation, but what is common to Presbytery or Independency; all of them being built on private interpretations of Scripture; ſaving a Being from the breath of the Civil Magiſtrate, by an eſtabliſhment in the Law; and, therefore, if the Law be mutable, the Religion will be mutable. Nor does it avail him to ſay, *The Rule of our Religion is unalterable, being the Holy Scripture, but the Exerciſe of it is under the Law.* For Presbytery once eſtabliſhed by Law, will ſpeak both Law and Scripture as loud as he. Thus ends the Vindication of the two Royal Papers: Long may they dure in the hands and hearts of all thoſe who love Truth.

THE

THE THIRD Royal Paper VINDICATED.

IT cannot but be very ſurprizing to behold a Gentleman pretending to no ordinary Size in Learning, rallying all his Forces to encounter a Princeſs (now in the midſt of Laurels) whom whilſt ſhe Lived, the great Figure ſhe made in the Court, left no time to improve by Art thoſe excellent Endowments with which Nature had plentifully enriched her; and who, generouſly humble, conſigned to paper this Profeſſion. *I am not able, or if I were, would I enter into Diſputes with any Body*, Her deſign was only the Satisfaction ſhe owed to her Friends, not any Engagement in the Quarrels of Diſputes; and what ſhe left behind her was but a bare and candid Narrative of thoſe great conflicts which ſhe ſuffered in

her Soul, upon the only neceſſary work of her Converſion to God. And, why a Paper ſo innocent, left by ſo great a Lady as a Legacy to her Friends, ſhould raiſe the Spleen of ſo great a Gyant to that degree as to tear it in pieces, and thus torn to disfigure it, and thus disfigured, to expoſe it, would have been a ſubject of great wonder, were it not obvious to ſuſpect the unhappy Genius, that moved him. But ſince ſhe has gained the point ſhe aim'd at, and ſo well ſatisfied her Friends, even to the Conviction of many Adverſaries, and to the admiration of all. I ſhall ſo recollect the Senſe of her Paper, by Deſign and Artifice diſjointed, that put together it will cement it ſelf, and the native Beauty will appear more reſplendent by his Neighbouring Shade.

The firſt attempt upon her Paper is from her own Conceſſion which is thus, *I am not able, or if I were, would I enter into Diſputes with any Body:* at this he ſeems aſtoniſhed, and hardly capable to underſtand, *how any one could be truly ſatisfied, as to the Grounds of leaving one Church, and going to the other, without entring into matter of Diſpute with any Body.* Before I reply, I cannot but obſerve a Coin newly Counterfeited; for the Dutcheſs does not ſay, ſhe will not enter into the *matter* of Diſputes, but only that ſhe will not enter into Diſputes, which are Expreſſions of ſo different a Nature, that the one may well be, and often is without the other. For the *matter* of Diſpute may be any thing, about which there may be no Diſpute. To deliver him then, from this aſtoniſh-

ment

ment, there are many ways to the Wood beſides one, and God in the Treaſury of his all-ſeeing Providence can ſo temper ſecond Cauſes, that even without Miracle he can work a thouſand Converſions of Souls from Errour to Truth, without any Diſpute; but he urges farther, *How could one, bred up in the Church of* England, *and ſo well inſtructed in the Doctrines of it ever ſatisfy herſelf in forſaking the Communion of it, without inquiring into, and comparing the Doctrines and Practiſes of both Churches?* If this will give him Content, I doubt not but all this may be, and is frequently performed *without diſputing with any Body*; for ſhe being now ſo well knowing in the Doctrines and Practiſes of the Church of *England*, ſhe had no more to do, but to make Inquiry into the Doctrines and Practiſes of the Church of *Rome*, and ſo by comparing them together, as in the colliſion of two Flints, might by her own Induſtry ſtrike out that Fire, and that Light, which might both comfort her Soul, and light it to the ſecure Haven of Eternity. *But this* he adds, *was not to be preſumed of a Perſon of her Condition, for many things muſt fall in her way, which ſhe could neither have leiſure to examine, nor the Capacity to judg of without the aſſiſtance of others.* As to this I muſt crave his Pardon; for if I be not miſ-informed by thoſe who had the Honour to know her, ſhe was a Princeſs of as ſearching a Wit, and of as clear a Judgment as any of her time: Nor can it be queſtioned but ſhe had time and leiſure enough; for ſhe that profeſſes to have found no reſt to her Soul Night nor Day, can

never be presumed to want time to hunt after that, which her Soul did so passionately Love, and if any difficulty had fallen in her way, which by her self she could not Conquer, she had choice of Learned Men of all Professions to consult, who might have so smooth'd all the Rubs that lay in her way, as to resolve her without any Dispute. *Had she not*, says he, *Divines of the Church of* England *about her to propose her scruples to*, yes, she had, and did so, and professes to have received such satisfaction from them, as contributed much to her Conversion to the Catholic Church; *which Discourses* she said, *did but add more to her desire of being a Catholic.* Now if this be reputed a *Dispute*, then every one who *advises* with his Divine or Lawyer in matters relating either to his Soul, or Estate; must be stil'd a *Disputant.*

To evince that her Royal Highness did not make use of the ordinary means for her own satisfaction, he brings for instance the Bishop of *Winchester, who had nearest Relation to her*, as having *bred her up in the Principles of the Church of* England, and was a Man *both able and willing to have removed any doubts.* As to the ability or inclination this Bishop had to have serv'd her, in removing her doubts or Scruples, I shall not dispute them; but this is certain, that notwithstanding all his care in her Education in the Protestant Religion, she was afterwards out of Love with it, and who knows whether this very Bishop at other times (at least accidentally) in his Discourses with her might not have

have dropt something, which taken up by her, might give an advance to her Converſion; as it fell out to the inſinuated yielding Biſhops? O, *but ſhe endeavoured to conceal her Scruples from him.* Admit ſhe did; and that, as the Palate naulſeats Meat which formerly it loved, ſo ſhe, either out of ſome diſguſt, or for reaſons beſt known to her ſelf, did not ſo well reliſh the advice given her by the Biſhop of *Winchester*. Had ſhe no Body elſe to conſult? If ſhe had, there is no reaſon to charge her with the not uſing ordinary means, unleſs this Gentleman has a Revelation for it.

After this, he cites the following diſcourſe of her Royal Highneſs, *That ſhe ſpake ſeverally to two of the beſt Biſhops we have in England, who both told her there were many things in the Roman Church, which it were much to be wiſhed we had kept; as Confeſſion, which was, no doubt, commanded of God: That praying for the dead was one of the ancient things in Chriſtianity: That for their parts they did it daily, though they would not own it. And afterwards preſſing one of them very much upon the other point, he told her that if he had been breed up a Catholic, he would not change his Religion, but that being of another Church, wherein he was ſure were all things neceſſary to Salvation, he thought it very ill, to give that Scandal, as to leave that Church wherein he received his Baptiſm. Which diſcourſe,* ſhe ſaid, *did but add more to the deſire ſhe had to be a Catholic.* By this long Text 'tis clear that her Royal Highneſs had made many ſteps towards the Catholic Religion.

Religion, and that the Conference ſhe had with theſe Biſhops did but add fuel to the flame that was within her, for ſuch is the reſult of her laſt words, *did but add more to the deſire ſhe had to be a Catholic.* This being ſo, her Highneſs, and the two Biſhops were now upon different terms, as Party and Party; ſhe making advantage of their Conceſſions, as of Truths coming out of the mouth of the Enemies to the Religion ſhe either actually profeſſed, or was inclinable to; and they, notwithſtanding thoſe Conceſſions, keeping their own ground: So that it was not the Authority, or Example of theſe Biſhops that prevailed with her, but Truth forced from an Enemy; which for that reaſon convinced her the more. Since therefore this Gentleman allows of the Conceſſions, 'tis unreaſonable to put this queſtion, *Why ſhould not the laſt words have greater force to have kept her in our Church, than the former to have drawn her from it?* Becauſe 'tis eaſier for a Catholic to believe a Proteſtant ſpeaking *againſt* himſelf in matters of Religion, than *for* himſelf: *Ex ore tuo te judico* is an Argument invincible againſt a Man's ſelf. The Conceſſions then being admitted both by the Catholic party, and theſe two Biſhops, ſhe had reaſon to believe them, as to the Conceſſions; but not in that wherein the Catholics and they differ'd, which was, *That all things neceſſary to Salvation are certainly in the Proteſtant Church, and that it was ill to leave it.*

The

The next two Paragraphs concern not her Royal Highneſs: For, whether the two Biſhops did let fall words inconſiſtent with their own Religion, or not, her work was done; ſhe not being obliged to reconcile them to their own Religion.

But the late Biſhop of *Wincheſter* inſtead of untying, has cut the knot a ſunder: *For*, ſays he, *he firſt doubts, whether there ever were ſuch Biſhops who made ſuch anſwers; and then he affirms, That he believes there never was in* rerum natura *ſuch a diſcourſe as is pretended.* What pity 'tis the Biſhop of *Wincheſter* ſhould be a perſon of ſo ſmall a faith, as not to give credit to ſo great a Lady in a concern wherein 'twas no advantage to her to tell a Lye; and, if ſhe had, was by all the Laws Divine and Humane bound to reſtitution for the wrong ſhe did them. *Non dimittitur peccatum niſi reſtituatur ablatum.* Or, if he doubted whether there were ever any ſuch Paper, we have now the Royal word of a King for it, atteſting it to be hers. Matters being thus, we do not charge upon the Church of *England* the ſingle Opinion of one, or two Biſhops, but 'tis reaſon to believe that a Lady thirſting after truth, might defer much to perſons of ſo eminent a rank in that Church.

This Gentleman I perceive is very ſtudious, very induſtrious to find a Lady in Errour, and hopes ſhe may contradict her ſelf; thus then, *She*

proteſts,

proteſts, in the preſence of Almighty God, that no perſon, Man or Woman, directly, or indirectly, ever ſaid any thing to her, (*ſince ſhe came into* England) *or uſed the leaſt endeavour to make her change her Religion, and that it is a bleſſing ſhe wholly owes to Almighty God. So that the Biſhops are acquitted from having any hand in it by her own words.* But I beſeech him, did ſhe or any elſe charge upon theſe Biſhops, that *they ſaid any thing to her, or uſed any endeavours to make her change her Religion?* How oft doth it happen, that the ſpeaker of words may utter them for one deſign, and the hearer make uſe of them for another, though then the Biſhops did not ſay any thing to her with *endeavour to make her change her Religion*, yet their words may have added much to the change of her Religion. He proceeds, *And as far as we can underſtand her meaning, ſhe thought her ſelf Converted by immediate Divine Illumination.* This conſtruction of her words, ſo tickled his fancy, that it made him ſport upon the Church of *Rome*'s private Spirit for a long time: But for my part (if he has done laughing) I can underſtand nothing of this *immediate Divine Illumination* from her words. For God, who diſpoſes of all things ſtrongly and ſweetly, has infinite methods to convert Souls to himſelf without *immediate Illumination*, by ſo unexpected a concourſe of ſecond Cauſes, ſo well tempered and knit together by his wiſdom, that a converſion of a Soul may and will follow thence, ſhe not knowing how; and conſequently as 'tis the ſole work of the Almighty, *ſo that bleſſing*

ſhe

ſhe wholly owes to him. What this Gentleman underſtands by a *private Spirit* I know not; but, be it what it will, 'tis therefore vitious, becauſe it is inconſiſtent with thoſe publick Methods and Rules God has left to govern his Church by; which whether the Proteſtants when they went out from the *Roman* Church did not deſert, by following an *Ignis Fatuus* of their own, in their ſingular interpretation of holy Scripture, againſt the known Senſe of their Mother Church, is the ſubject of another diſpute; or rather indeed 'tis put out of all diſpute that they then did, unleſs they can ſhew that the conſtant Tradition and Practice of the Primitive Church interpreted Scripture as they then did, in all the Points they reform'd in; which they know is impoſſible.

Her Royal Highneſs declares, that *ſhe would never have changed, if ſhe thought ſhe could have ſaved her Soul otherwiſe*, and he anſwers, *if this were true* ſhe had good *reaſon for her change; if it were not true, ſhe had none; as it is moſt certain it was not.* I cannot perſwade my ſelf that this Gentleman would force his Modeſty to ſuch a Degree, as to give the Lye to a Lady of her tranſcendent Quality; eſpecially who had been ſo well *bred up in the Principles of the Church of* England. I ſhall rather favour him with this Conſtruction, that tho' ſhe thought what ſhe ſaid was true, yet in reality it was not.

But how came she to make this Declaration? she tells us, *she never had any scruple till the* November *before, and then they began upon reading Doctor* Heylin's *History of the Reformation; which was commended to her, as a Book to settle her; and there she found such abominable Sacriledge upon* Henry *the Eighth's Divorce,* King Edward's *Minority, and* Queen Elizabeth's *Succession, that she could not believe the Holy Ghost could ever be in such Councils.* And, because Doctor *Heylin's* History wrought her Conversion, he seems to be displeased at the Author of that Advice; but I must needs dissent from him: for, it being a History of the Reformation, it was more fit to put that into her hands *to settle her* in her Religion, if the Reformation had been from God, being within her Sphere, than any Book of Controversy; wherein she might have been plunged into difficulties insuperable, the Objection oftentimes out-weighing the Solution. And tho' *in the History of Reformation* he tells us, *there are two distinct parts. The one built on Scripture and Antiquity*; the other upon *Maxims of State*; yet the one being visible, and the other invisible, had she been a Person of *greater Understanding*, than she was, how could she possibly discern both? what he requires to have been the Subject of her Consideration, was so far beyond her Reach, that more Speculative Persons, than her Condition would permit her to be, come short of that Performance: and therefore no better way could be, than to be conversant with such Objects, or motives

tives as were of her own ſize. One of which was that where the Foundations of a Pretended Reformation were Sacriledge, Rapine, and Luſt, *She could not believe the Holy Ghoſt could ever be in ſuch Councils.* He replies thus; *were not the Vices of* Alexander *the Sixth, and of many other Popes, as great at leaſt as thoſe of* Henry *the Eighth?* Be it ſo, and ſuppoſe them greater; therefore neither ſhe, nor any Body elſe in Prudence can believe that God ever choſe *Alexander* the Sixth, or ſuch as he points at by vitiouſly acting to be the Reformers of his Church, or to give Being to a Reformation.

As to the Invaſion upon the Rights and Lands of the Church; he replies to by Retaliation: *Are there not Miſcarriages of the like Nature in the Church of* Rome? It may be ſo, but if by ſuch Miſcarriages one ſhould think to reform the Church, I ſhall as freely declare with this great Lady, that I cannot believe, *the Holy Ghoſt can ever be in ſuch Councils.*

From her ſcruples which the reading of Dr. *Heylin*'s Hiſtory of the Reformation, had put into her mind, ſhe came to the Examen (*of points in difference*) *by the Holy Scriptures, where it ſeems,* ſays he, *contrary to the Doctrine of the Church of* Rome, *ſhe found ſome things ſo eaſie, that ſhe wondered ſhe had been ſo long without finding them out.* That ſome things may eaſily be met with in Holy Scripture, makes not againſt the Doctrine of the

Church of *Rome*; nay ſtanding to the bare Letter, without the aſſiſtance of Tradition, experience has made it manifeſt that her Champions have fought againſt all ſorts of Enemies, with that ſucceſs, even at their own weapon, that partiality it ſelf cannot deny her the Victory. Nor is it any great wonder, that a Lady of her great endowments, being but yet a ſeeker of Truth, and not acquainted with the Catholic Rules of Expounding Scriptures, and having no other intereſt, but her Soul's ſafety, ſhould eaſily find what ſhe did not formerly, when ſhe thought her ſelf ſecure, and was not concern'd, nay what great Doctors do paſs ſlightly over, when thouſands of leſſer Talents than ſhe, have done the like. What diſcoveries then hath ſhe made? First, *of the Real Preſence, then of the Infallibility, of Confeſſion, and praying for the Dead.*

As to the *Real Preſence* importing a *Real and Subſtantial change of the Elements into the Body and Blood of Chriſt.* He demands, *In what words of Chriſt is it to be found?* I anſwer in theſe, *This is my Body*: And whereas he adds, *That the wiſeſt Perſons of the Church of* Rome *have confeſſed, that the bare words of our Saviour can never prove it.* I anſwer, 'Tis hard for him to determine who are the wiſeſt; but he knows well that they generally teach, that thoſe words cannot be verify'd, without that change. *Confeſſion of Sins*, as ever commanded, is no harder to meet withal, than

confeſs

confeſs your ſins to one another. And if the Apoſtles and in them their Succeſſors, had power to *forgive* and *retain* ſins, there muſt be an Obligation in others to *confeſs* them, otherwiſe that power had been uſeleſs. *Praying for the Dead* is alſo frequently grounded upon Scripture, and though her Royal Highneſs ſeems to have been ſomewhat confirmed in the belief of it, by the conceſſion of the two Biſhops, yet ſhe no where affirm'd that to be the ſole Motive to change her Religion, but only that it *added more to her deſire of being a Catholic.* The Places uſually cited for the *Infallibility* of the Church, he would perſwade us may as well be apply'd to other Churches, as to the *Roman*; but becauſe I have already proved the *Roman to be that one Catholic Church*, I ſhall ſuperſede from any further trouble at the preſent. From Chriſt's promiſe of *being with the Church to the end of the World* (and ſhe now believing no other Church, to be that Church, but that which is called the *Roman*) ſhe makes this inference, *That our Saviour would not permit the Church to give the Laity the Communion in one kind, if it were not lawful ſo to do.* This Illation is evident; for otherwiſe, he would not be with his Church to the end of the world.

From this excellent Diſcourſe of her Royal Highneſs, 'tis an invincible Truth, that all the force of Senſe and Reaſon do center in this concluſion, *that ſhe did not think it poſſible to ſave her Soul, otherwiſe than in the Roman Church*; and by her Paper

per the world may see the pregnant Power of Truth, which forced those two great Lights of *England*'s Church to a *private* concession of what in *publick* they were unwilling to own. *Magna est veritas & prævalebit.*

FINIS.

A Catalogue of Books Sold by *Matthew Turner* at the *Lamb* in *High-Holbourn.*

ACTS of the Clergy of *France*: The second Edition: To which is added a neceſſary advice how to read Books of Controverſie *Quarto.*

A Diſcourſe of the neceſſity of Church Guides, *Quarto.*

The Guide in Controverſies. Four Parts. *Quarto.*

A True Narrative of the pretended Popiſh Plot, with Figures.

A Papiſt *Miſ-repreſented* and *Repreſented*, Quarto.

Why are you a *Catholic*? And, Why are you a *Proteſtant*, Quarto.

Biſhop *Condom*'s Diſcourſe of Univerſal Hiſtory, *Octavo.*

Digitus Dei againſt *Nullifidians*, Octavo.

The MASS Triumphing, *Octavo.*

The *MASS* Vindicated, *Octavo.*

Veron's Rule of Faith, *Octavo.*

Biſhop *Condom*'s Expoſition of Catholic Doctrine, *Twelves.*

——His Treatiſe of Communion in both Species, *Twelves.*

The

The Touch-ſtone of the Reformed Goſpel, *Twelves.*

Turberville's Manual of Controverſies, *Twelves.*

——Abridgment of Chriſtian Doctrine, *Eighteens.*

Vane's Loſt Sheep Return'd home, *Twelves.*

Counſels of Wiſdom, or the Maxims of *Solomon*, Twelves.

The Catechiſm of Penance, *Eighteens.*

Four Maxims of Eternity, *Eighteens.*

Chriſtian Thoughts for every Day, *Twentyfours.*

St. *Francis de Sales* Introduction to a Devout Life, *Twelves.*

Thomas of *Kempis* Following of Chriſt. In *Twelves* and *Twentyfours.*

THE END.